

EXHIBIT 6



Debevoise & Plimpton LLP
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
+1 212 909 6000

February 4, 2016

VIA EMAIL

Ronnie Spiegel, Esq.
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
1918 Eighth Avenue, Suite 3300
Seattle, WA 98101

In re Automotive parts Antitrust Litigation

Dear Ronnie:

This responds to your letter of February 2, 2016. I can confirm that, based on our investigation to date, we expect TEMA and TMS to have the information sought in the subpoena and that, to the extent the state manufacturing entities, TMNA, TLS or Calty have responsive information, it would be duplicative of the information held by TEMA and TMS. With respect to your questions about Calty, we expect that any information Calty would have related to Requests 1(c) (information regarding (among other things) the makes/models for which a particular part was intended) and 1(g) (information regarding RFQs) would be duplicative of information in TEMA's possession.

Based on these representations, we appreciate the parties' agreement to hold in abeyance the subpoenas to Toyota Motor Manufacturing Alabama, Inc., Toyota Motor Manufacturing Indiana, Inc., Toyota Motor Manufacturing Kentucky, Inc., Toyota Motor Manufacturing Mississippi, Inc., Toyota Motor Manufacturing Texas, Inc., Toyota Motor Manufacturing West Virginia, Inc., TMNA, TLS and Calty. We understand that, should our understanding of the facts change (*i.e.*, if it turns out that these entities possess responsive information not in TEMA's or TMS's possession), the parties may pursue the subpoenas. Please let us know immediately if this understanding is incorrect.

Ronnie Spiegel

2

February 4, 2016

Lastly, as you know, the Toyota entities are among the OEMs litigating the scope and burden of the parties' subpoena. Nothing in this letter should be construed as an agreement to produce information or an agreement that particular information can be readily produced.

Very truly yours,



Mike Schaper